

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application at the time the Office Action was mailed. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 15-16, and 19-20 are amended, and claims 7, 9-14, and 17-18 are cancelled. New claims 21-24 are presented for examination. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 8, 15-16, and 19-24 are pending.

Applicants' representatives wish to thank Examiners Belousov and Myhre for the telephonic interview conducted on March 16, 2007, in which the parties discussed a proposed amendment to claim 1. Additional details regarding the interview are provided below. Should the Examiner need further information, he is asked to contact the undersigned.

The Examiner rejected independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,515,496 to Kaehler et al ("Kaehler") and again under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rathbone, "Windows 95® For Dummies®" ("Rathbone"). As discussed in the interview, neither Kaehler nor Rathbone teach or suggest "displaying a first toolset if the object has been selected, the first toolset providing a first set of handles for manipulating the object; ... [and] if the pointer is stationary over the object for a threshold length of time, displaying a second toolset, the second toolset providing a second set of handles for manipulating the object differently from the manipulation of the first set of handles," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner believes that Kaehler's select box corresponds to the claimed first toolset. When Kaehler's select box is selected, edit handles are displayed, which the Examiner believes correspond to the claimed second toolset. The select box, however, is not a toolset that "provid[es] a first set of handles for manipulating the object," as recited in claim 1. Rather, the select box simply provides a mechanism by which a user can request the display of the edit handles. The select box cannot be used to manipulate the object. The Examiner also believes that in Rathbone, the "Programs ... Shut Down" menu corresponds to the claimed first toolset. When the "Programs" icon is selected, the "Accessories ... Windows Explorer" menu is displayed,

which the Examiner believes corresponds to the claimed second toolset. The "Programs ... Shut Down" menu, however, is not a toolset that "provid[es] a first set of handles for manipulating the object," as recited in claim 1. Rather, it provides icons to launch a process or display another menu, and the icons cannot be used to manipulate the object. Moreover, the "Accessories ... Windows Explorer" menu is not a toolset that "provid[es] a second set of handles for manipulating the object differently from the manipulation of the first set of handles," as recited in claim 1. Rather, it too provides icons to launch a process or display another menu, and the icons cannot be used to manipulate the object.

Furthermore, neither Kaehler nor Rathbone teach or suggest "when a first handle of the first toolset is selected, performing a manipulation on the object in accord with the first handle; and when a second handle of the second toolset is selected, performing a manipulation on the object in accord with the second handle," as recited in claim 1. Neither of these references have two toolsets.

The Examiner rejected independent claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kaehler. Applicants have amended independent claim 15 to recite "displaying a first toolset, the first toolset providing a first set of handles operative to perform a first type of operation on the graphic; if the pointer is positioned over the graphic for a threshold length of time, displaying a second toolset, the second toolset providing a second set of handles operative to perform a second type of operation on the graphic; when a user interacts the pointer with a first handle of the first toolset, performing the first type of operation on the graphic; and when the user interacts the pointer with a second handle of the second toolset, performing the second type of operation on the graphic." As discussed above, neither Kaehler nor Rathbone teach or suggest these features.

New independent claim 21 recites "a component that displays the object and a first toolset, the first toolset providing a first set of handles for manipulating the object; a component that, when the pointer is stationary over the object for a threshold length of time, displays a second toolset, the second toolset providing a second set of handles for

manipulating the object differently from the manipulation of the first set of handles, wherein the accessibility of the first toolset is maintained while the second toolset is displayed; a component that, when a user interacts the pointer with a first handle of the first toolset, performs a manipulation on the object in accord with the first handle; and a component that, when the user interacts the pointer with a second handle of the second toolset, performs a manipulation on the object in accord with the second handle." As discussed above, neither Kaehler nor Rathbone teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 15, and 21 are patentable over the cited art. Because the dependent claims import the limitations from the claims on which they depend, they also are patentable over the cited art.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268836US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 4/17/07

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant